

In the *specification*

This Office Action was argue writing below:

【Application is required to cancel the new matter in reply to this Office Action. 】

What the new matter?

In specification of Detailed Action, the Examiner was arguing on writing below: (page 2)

1. The narcotic sprayer is new matter. (Narcotic spray)
2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: please do not list the numbers that represent the parts of the invention next to the figure like "Fig. 1 f" as this is confusing as to suggests that there is a Fig 1f when there is not.
3. Furthermore, on page 12, part B.b. what is a "launcher" seems to be a spelling error. What is a "laucher" ? (launcher)

1. About the narcotic sprayer is not new matter?

However, in the first revision to the Application of the second section, inventor had to clarify the doubt of " In claim 7, what is a narcotic gun? " raised for defense that:

【Among other improvements, the substitute specification condenses the abstract into a single paragraph and provides a new title, as required on page 2 of the Office Action. It also inserts an antecedent basis in the specification for the wrong for translate, such the " narcotic sprayer " to replace the " narcotic guns " in claim 7 and the remote control plane of claim 9 (for the narcotic guns, see page 12 of the substitute specification, line 2, and for the remote control plane, see page 15 of the substitute specification, lines 16-19). 】

However, inventor in A (3) of "Detailed Description of the Preferred Embodiments" of the original specification wrote "chemical spraying guns" instead of "the narcotic guns" in claim 7 because narcotics is a form of chemical. Furthermore, in the first amendment by applicant so as "narcotic sprayer" to replace the "narcotic guns" in claim 7. Therefore, we seek to ask the Examiner whether it is therefore make vetoed when "The narcotic sprayer is new matter"?

Based on the above-mentioned, it seems that the term "sprayer" had been used instead of "guns" is misunderstanding of Sino-British translation show clearly in claim of original that "the narcotic guns" change to "the narcotic sprayer" same should can accept! Come to saying from another gradation, inventor's amendment have doubt about the Examiner, therefore, the misunderstanding should not exist.

The Drawing's amendment can make the patent apply for perfect, the specification's argument are not present again.

About the Claim Rejection -35 USC 112:

Examiner's argument shown in the paragraph 2. of the DETAILED ACTION as below:

【It is not understood how the double door system works. As shown in figure 1 and 4, if the person trying to enter the cockpit through the double door system, why is the weight sensor and voice recognition system, etc. not in the space covered by the double door. Why is there a double entry space in figure 1?】 (page 3, line 7)

Apparently, see the thick body and add this base line of two sentence that are under "Fig. 1f &

Fig.4f” were omitted. The letter of 2 attached confirmed inventor’s original design was not honest omitted by the “RABIN & BERDO, P.C.” of Washington or Giant Group Int’L Pat., TM. & Law Office of Taiwan! Why the P. C of RABIN & BERDO. do not reply filed before the Final time limit of Nov.14, 2002 again? why inventor self have to filed with speed post? Examiner, Mr. Tien Quang Dinh, was an eyewitness that it is not an accidental incident for violated professional ethics.

Therefore, inventor ask the official of examiner to accept again filed same the 3 attached thus the augment to amendment request in Nov. 28, 2002. In this present amendment, will to be same with brackets being used to identify deletions from the previous version of the rewritten specification and with underlining being used to identify additions to the previous version.

The respectful Examiner will not to misinterpret that is shown there a double entry space in figure 1 and not in the space covered by the double door, the 3 attached of amendment request in Nov. 28, 2002 again in this present amendment and below: (See 13 page B1 a & b)

- a. [FIG.1-a & b. are shown, install]Two unidirectionally transparent bullet-proof glass doors are hidden as shown in Fig.1 a & b. When closed, the doors push out from the dotted line of Fig.1 f, Fig.1 r. shown the check place which is enclose by closing two the doors. from the cabin to the passage as a second door, so that the pilot can see the passage unidirectionally, making hijackers conscious of someone looking at them in the dark.
- b. Fig.4 f are [As] shown [in Fig.4 a & b, the back and from panels] install hidden in a and b of the bullet-proof glass door are both unidirectionally transparent, when they push on and closed, with a 0.8-1 meter single person checkroom in between[;]. Fig. 4 [c. is shown] also shows a detector c of a raster curtain[; FIG.4 d. is shown], a detector d for identifying weight[;], [FIG.4 e. is shown] [and] a detector [of] e for a password card[;], [FIG.4 h is shown] a detector h of [Five-finger] a five-finger mold test[;], and a [FIG.4 i.] detector [of Image test] i for an image test. [FIG.4 j. is shown a] Fig. 4 also shows a detector j of human body infrared[;], [FIG.4 k. is shown] a launcher k of special beams for the raster curtain, and a [FIG.4 l. is shown] detector [of] l for voice recognition[; they will be]. These detectors automatically identifying weight, a password card, [fingerprint] fingerprints, and an image, and provide a voice test. Although FIGS.1 and 4 show elements c, d, h, i, k, and l at positions offset from the “single person checkroom” that is provided between and enclose by closed two the doors.
- c. As shown in FIG.2, the [front and back panels] install hide in a and b of the double doors are closed under the double control of closing instructions of airplane in flight status and ground-based monitoring center, meanwhile turning on the automatic identifier.

The (old) Fig.1a & b. or (old) Fig.4 a & b that are shown sheath for the double door, “the back and from panels” is wrongly mistranslated, the translator’s opinion was to use “back” and “panels” to represent the two surfaces of the “sheath”. The crucial point at this time is that the examiner should not deepen the misunderstanding further by (old) Fig. 1f & (old) Fig.4f and express the location of open the double door of dotted line were deliberately omitted only.

Above-mentioned c. [Front and back panels] is a translation’s problem should be amended and thus the “install hidden in a and b of the double doors” with same the application Priority Data (cn 01255903.2), the location of double doors open in the figure and that is not a new matter, the page2 c. of specification also for the same explanation.

The Examiner should understand that the double door system works from c. of above-mentioned and accompany an airliner to set sail and then close the double door that begin the system works in (old) Fig.3

Examiner’s argument to carry on shown in the Claims Rejections – 35 USC ~ 112, paragraph 3.of

the DETAILED ACTION as below:

【It seems that all the sensors are located in the “k” section and not in the space defined by the double door.】 (page 3, line 11)

Apparently, it was under the examiner’s illusion that “Fig. 1f & Fig. 4f” were omitted.

But, in any event, inventor request for the examiner Mr. Quang Dinh to agree on the amendment of above-mentioned, because inventor’s figure 2 of priority (CN 01 2 55903.2 25092001) shown only a space (b) defined by opened the double door and that all the sensors are located in the space (b) with the “k” section.

【Further in claim 6, what is a raster curtain? A curtain is defined as “material that hangs in a window or other opening as a decoration, shade, or screen.” How could this be used to scan a person entering the cockpit. Furthermore, what is a “means for generating can” as claim 6. How does it work? In addition, what is a detector means for detecting whether the raster curtain has been breached? How does it work? How can it be used to detect a breach in the curtain?】 (page 3, line 13)

Inventor thinks, to fail to understand what is a raster curtain that is finesse examination for the examiner!

Someone skillful will understood and undoubtedly know that the “raster curtain” are permuting from countless beam of light and get used to shelter for isolation and purification of the detection environment, inventor request to add in the specification that are below:

1. The purpose of “raster curtain” is prevent any person from touching the wall of “single person checkroom” to guarantee the accuracy of the weight sensor.
2. The beam of light can select infrared ray and the launcher of special beams for the raster curtains are located in the “k” section.

Inventor bet one’s life in here, any hijackers can stop dreaming about taking over the aircraft by breaking and untying this two alone and unprecedented of technical to restriction of “single person checkroom”! For sure, this application of two technologies was to innovate than the Garehime’s system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre and as taught by Anastassakis!

【In claim 7, what is a narcotic sprayer? How does it work?】 (page 4, line 3)

the examiner had brought up the doubt and before instructed to increase a figure for statement ! Therefore, Fig. 6 shows the perfect description on how the narcotic sprayers are installed at the four passages of the entrance of the airliner. As a matter of fact, this is only a simple skill.

【In claim 9, how does the remote-control plane is prepared to control the airliner? The details seem lacking for one of ordinary skill to know how this system operates. 】 (page 3, line 4) the Examiner’s misgiving can understand.

The remote-control plane’s back-up of system and operates same the ground-based monitoring center that may be provided so that it can take off and take control of the airliner in the event the signal from the monitoring center lacks sufficient coverage.

To summarized above the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph had four do not understood, because the “Fig. 1f & Fig. 4f” of omitted had to be reinstate and illustrated by the correction list of Figure further, inventor to firmly believe something to be true that 35 U.S.C. 112,

second paragraph is not obstacle to rejects claims.

About the Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph (page 4, line 6)

The Office Action rejects claim 1, line 1 to bring up, "~~A double-door 'single person checkroom'~~ is that provides" is vague and do not understand what does "is that provides" mean? (Page 4, line 9)

In this rejects, inventor will to say sorry, because the "provides" of "is that provides" is a spelling error and will amendment for "is that providing"! Because inventor's spelling error to study from the abstract of Garehime, Jr. (US Patent No.4644845), that below:

「An electronic image sensor is optically coupled with the scope and provides an image to a video surveillance screen at a remote station.」

As a matter of fact, it is redundant to add 's' after provide, that the synonym is supplied, given and furnished.

The Office Action rejects claim 1, line 3, "including first and second door that are to be connected open and closed positions of one another" is vague. What does this mean? Does this means that if one door is open the other will open also? (Page 4, line 11)

The double-door are closed From taking off and open and closed of stipulate course that must according to (new) Fig. 4. The double-door are can not open and closed at the same time, the one of program control is below:

「2nd door Close an Auto-signal to limit → (Fig.2-b)Open 1stdoor 」

Therefore, inventor request to amendment in Claim 1. below: planned

"...including first and second door that are to be connected with an appointed program to open and closed positions of one another "

The Office Action rejects clam 6, the claim language is confusing. It is not understood what " means for generating can to set different frequency's beams " mean 」（page 4, line 14)

If the beam of light can be set differently with the frequency's that shown the beam of light cannot to imitate! The consequences of imitation will make various inspections lose efficacy. This is an innovation of application in the field of burglarproof and precaution skyjacking and the claim language is summary all the frequency change of light beam that is reasonably.

Inventor could proud of point out again, in Garehime's system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre and as taught by Anastassakis that can not to search out had any means to compare the novelty for science and technology in this field

The Office Action rejects in claim 8, 「concealed electronic monitoring device is a double inclusion of elements in view of claim 1, part b. Are there different concealed electronic monitoring devices.」 (page 4, line 16)

This is examiner's misunderstood, the claim 1, part b is emphasized that monitoring of cockpit and

the ground monitor center, but the claim 8 is emphasized the monitoring by involves with a relay satellite or special frequency band.

To summarized above the Office Action under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph had four rejects:

1. Is a spelling error;
2. Examiner can not to perceived the program control of double-door in Fig.3;
3. Inventor to hold on to one's own views, the claim language is summary all the frequency change of light beam that is reasonably.
4. This is Examiner's misunderstood.

Inventor firmly believes that something true about the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is not a reason to rejects claims. Thank instruction of Office Action. Inventor will modify the claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice.

About the Office Action rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103 (page 5)

The Office Action rejects :

¶ Claims 1-3, and 8, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garehime in view of Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre. ¶ (page 5, line 8)

¶ Garehime discloses an aircraft anti-hijacking system having a concealed monitoring device to deter potential hijackers but lacks the system to allow ground base system to control the aircraft or the "flight trajectory calibrator", the means to monitor the aircraft from the ground, and the double-door system with means to determine the accessibility of a person to the cockpit and the door system having transparent bulletproof glass. ¶ (page 5, line 10)

In first Office Action had made a statement to indicate that Garehime invention **discloses a narcotic gun...but it was not find!** By the same token in this Office Action had made a statement to indicate that the Garehime's discloses an aircraft hijacking system having a **concealed monitoring device!** But the "concealed" of words is not finding again! At more further to point, in the Garehime's instruction, the " aircraft hijacking " of words was not find too!

In inventor's replied of first Office Action, the defence were below:

¶ Garehime (US Pat. No. 4,644,854) discloses a bullet-firing weapon having an electronic image sensor incorporated therewith, while the present invention discloses a narcotic gun that is actually an ejector. A bullet-firing weapon is not legally allowed for installing on a passenger plane. The American government has not yet legislated to permit installation of security means, such as bullet-firing weapons, on passenger planes, at least at the time the patent application for the invention of Zhen-Man Lin is filed. In view that the "monitoring device" is not a patented invention made by Garehime, it is not appropriate to reject the patentability of Zhen-Man Lin's invention based on the Garehime's invention and teaches of Zekich and Feher. ¶

The traits of list in first defense:

1. Garehime's weapon system has not yet legislated to permit installation of security means on a passenger plane;
2. the "monitoring device" is not a patented invention made by Garehime;
3. Independent and concealed electronic monitoring device were Lin's invention of innovation thereof than the Garehime's "monitoring device" means;

4. Independent and concealed power supply system were Lin's invention of innovation thereof than the Garehime's "monitoring device" means;

The second Office Action to admitted:

5. Garehime's systems were lacks the system to allow ground base system to control the aircraft or the "flight trajectory calibrator".

The Office Action do not opposed to the above-mentioned viewpoint and the traits of list shown and that though same the invention of "monitoring device" means, but Garehime's invention to be utterly useless in the scope of aircraft hijacking system! Lin's invention of innovation is obvious, why the examiner quoted stilled to rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103 too? Inventor does not understand and is at lost.

The examiner's wrong simultaneously be to quote Zekich's invention to rejects the double door system of Claims 1-3, and 8:

【Zekich discloses a double door system having clear bullet proof glass and identification means (five finger mold) are well known in the art. 】 (page 5, line 14)

In inventor's replied of first Office Action, the defense were below:

【Zekich (US Pat. No. 4,586,441) discloses a revolving door system installed with bulletproof glass, while Zhen-Man Lin discloses a "unidirectionally" transparent bulletproof glass door that allows only the pilot to see the passage from one direction of the door and makes the hijackers conscious of someone is looking at them. This is an important military concept and has increased deterrent force against the hijackers.

Moreover, the system taught by Zekich lacks the detector of human body infrared and the detector of image test.

The "hand geometry reader" disclosed in Zekich's invention is exactly the hand geometry reading and measuring means disclosed in US Pat. No. 3,648,240 granted to Jacoby et al. On the other hand, the "five-finger mold test" disclosed in Zhen-Man Lin's invention employs image scan technique to supply data to a computer for splitting and comparing through computerized procedures. Lin's "five-finger mold test" is completely different from Zekich's hand geometry reader in terms of checking manner, and the two measures are products of different times.

In the double-door system disclosed by Zhen-Man Lin, all the tests are conducted within the zone defined by the raster curtain. Without doing so, all the tests are subject to errors and fail to successfully deal with a terrorist like Ben la den. The double-door system taught by Lin is an absolutely important and novel invention.

Moreover, a double-door and a revolving door are different in terms of their physical spatial dimensions. It is obvious the double-door is more suitable for use on a passenger plane due to its reduced volume as compared with the revolving door. An important nature of patent in the scope of intellectual properties involves the novelty and originality of an invention. It is improper to deny the originality of an invention (Lin's double-door) just because the existence of another early structure (the revolving door).】

The traits of list in first defense by inventor:

1. Zekich's double-door is a revolving door and their physical spatial dimensions. This is a bad design of structural in a passenger plane, because the use-space of Zekich's invention about seven of multiple then the Izm's invention!
2. Zekich's double door system of the clear bullet proof glass is out-of-date in security system, but Lin's double door system are equipped with unidirectionally-transparent of the bullet proof glass and that significant of novelty and originality in security system;
3. Zekich's identification means is "hand geometry reader" was out-of-date in security system today! Because the means is an antique of " geometry-test", but Lin's invention for "five-finger & palm mold test" is novelty and originality of the Digital Video !
4. Zekich's all test of double-door system lacks same Lin's novelty-invention can prevent any person from touching the wall of the "raster curtain" means;

Why the Lin's "five-finger mold test" change to "five-finger & palm mold test"? Please to see the page3 line 1 of priority (CN01255903.2 25092001) that 『全五指掌模』 of correctly translate is "five-finger & palm mold test", inventor request to amendment.

The Office Action do not opposed to the above-mentioned viewpoint and the traits of list shown and that though an appellation same of the invention of double door system and five finger mold, why the examiner quoted stilled to rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103 too? Inventor is does not understood and to be at a loss!

The examiner's wrong simultaneously be to quote the Feher discloses means to monitor the aircraft from the ground as well as "Flight Trajectory Calibrator 80" are well known in the art. to rejects Claims 1-3, and 8 :

In inventor's replied of first Office Action, the defense were below:

- I Feher (US Pat. No. 4,816,828) discloses an aircraft damage assessment and surveillance system. If the electronic image sensor disclosed in Garehime's patented invention (US Pat. No. 4,644,845) could completely replace Feher's invention, why is Feher's granted a patent two years later after Garehime has obtained the patent?

Feher discloses a surveillance system that is not designed to prevent a hijack, while Zhen-Man Lin discloses a systematic solution program for preventing airliner hijack. In Lin's airliner hijacking prevention system, narcotic ejector guns are installed above the cross-shaped passages of the four entrances of the plane (see number "3" in Fig. 1) and could be actuated from either the ground monitoring center or the cockpit.

The zones on the plane available by the hijackers are therefore largely restricted. The surveillance system disclosed by Feher does not include an independent and concealed power supply system and tends to be shut down by the hijackers and becomes completely useless.

On the other hand, Lin's invention emphasizes the use of an independent and concealed power supply system for monitoring and communication systems on the plane. Feher does not suggest the use of satellite relay stations and standby remote-control plane in his surveillance system, while Lin does.

In brief, Feher's surveillance system and Lin's airliner hijacking prevention system are completely different in the fields to which they are to be applied. It is obvious Feher's invention can not replace Lin's

invention at all in terms of their application fields.]

In the first place, inventor will ask why the Feher's "telemetry transmitter 80" can be to description for "Flight Trajectory Calibrator 80"? This is an obvious wrong by Examiner again. The "telemetry transmitter 80" only to transmitter the optical images that are capturing by camera shown in Fig.4 of Feher's invention, however, Lin's "Flight Trajectory Calibrator" has stored up various air-routes relatively of flight control data to base on satellite from ground that signal of fixed position, therefore that were poles apart in the two of them! The Examiner's wrong should to be bring not fair of obviously for inventor!

Except for the "Flight Trajectory Calibrator 80" was totally fictitious, the Feher discloses means of monitor same the Garehime! Garehime's patent to approved on Feb.24, 1987 but Feher's patent to approved on Mar.28, 1989 and between to their difference only two years, case is a criterion in American administration of justice and same all patent of examine in Office Action. **In evidence,** Feher's discloses means of monitor does not rejects by Garehime, if the means of monitor in Lin's invention rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103 from Garehime and Feher that should be to bias or discriminate against and to say nothing of that had two originality of innovation points in the Art., they are to be the champion the independent and concealed electronic monitoring device and power supply system thereof.

The Examiner's wrong simultaneously be to quote the Borthayre's "flight trajectory calibrator system" of invention to rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103:

【Borthayre discloses a system to take control away from the cockpit to the ground system via a special frequency band is well known in the art. Borthayre inherently has a flight trajectory calibrator system to know where the aircraft is and going so it can control the aircraft.】 (page 5, line 17)

In inventor's replied of first Office Action, the defense were below:

¶ Zhen-Mian Lin's invention is actually an improvement on Borthayre's design (FR Pat. No. 2584842). The expression of "on the crew or the passengers which, by virtue of their combination and their interrelations" in the Abstract of Borthayre's invention clearly verifies the system taught by Borthayre includes automatic homing device that can be actuated only through the cooperation of the crew and the passengers. It is obviously questionable by whom the automatic homing device is actuated in the event the crews are under control of the hijackers and the passengers are not trained at all. And, what if the pilot(s) should be a terrorist? Lin's invention obviously solves this problem by having the power of remote-controlled homing or steering to be controlled by the ground-monitoring center.

In Borthayre's invention, there is not provided the independent and concealed power supply system. The ordinary power supply systems on the plane tend to be shut down by the hijackers and become completely useless. However, Lin's invention emphasizes the use of an independent and concealed power supply system for monitoring and communication systems on the plane.

Borthayre's invention does not disclose the use of satellite relay stations and standby remote-control plane in his monitoring system. What if the plane in trouble should be a location far away from the ground control center, or what if the signal of homing should be affected by geographical or weather conditions? For the sake of the crews' safety, Lin's invention has stressed the solution in this aspect.

Borthayre's invention does not include the flight trajectory (or orbit) calibrator disclosed in Lin's invention. The flight trajectory calibrator disclosed in Lin's invention enables a real-time report to the

ground-monitoring center about any tendency of the plane to deviate the normal flight course. J

The traits of list in first defense by inventor:

1. Borthayre's design must resort to: "on the crew or the passengers which, by virtue of their combination and their interrelations", the artificial-factor can make aircraft anti-hijacking system to lose efficacy;
2. Borthayre's invention does not provided the independent and concealed power supply system.
3. Borthayre's invention does not disclose the use of satellite relay stations and standby remote-control plane in his monitoring system.
4. Borthayre's invention does not include the flight trajectory (or orbit) calibrator disclosed in Lin's invention.
5. Borthayre's invention does not disclose that has the independent and concealed electronic system and power supply system thereof.

In the first place, inventor will ask that the Borthayre's invention does not include the flight trajectory calibrator system, why the Examiner can to give as a present again?

Lin's "Flight Trajectory Calibrator" has stored up various air-routes relatively of flight control data to base on satellite from ground that signal of fixed position and it has a self-record system for a new Flight Trajectory and that can check to compare corresponding with the air-routes trajectory data from install in advance, if having improper of flight that the "Flight Trajectory Calibrator" can self-motion to inform ground control center shortly.

If the "911" incident not any more to recurred that will cannot obstinate and blindly as taught by Borthayre again, because to start return navigation equipment that should must to be "on the crew or the passengers which, by virtue of their combination and their interrelations". In the evidence, Borthayre's invention is out-of-date and is clumsy for the aircraft anti-hijacking system.

The Office Action do not opposed to the above-mentioned viewpoint and the traits of list in shown and that though same little the Lin's claims of "Flight Trajectory Calibrator" means of airliner hijacking prevention system, rejects under 35 U.S.C. 112, 103? The examination is not fair!

The Examiner would have been obvious to make use of incorrect ratiocination to piece together an aircraft anti-hijacking system and rejects under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) to be aimed at Lin's invention:

【It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art. at the time the invention was made to have used double door system having clear bullet proof glass and identification Means (five fingers mold), means to monitor the aircraft from the ground system in Garehime's system as taught by Zekch, Feher, Borthayre to prevent the hijackers from taking over the aircraft. As for the term consists, please note that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to have taken away non-critical elements of the security system in Garehime's system to reduce complexity and reduce weight. J (page 5, line 21)

If the examiner used to piece together the out-of-date and clumsy for the aircraft anti-hijacking system and further in Garehime's system to reduce complexity and reduce weight that be equal to hoped-for the "911" incident occurs in! Why? Because if the hijackers coerce a hostage and that can easily to break through the out-of-date and clumsy for the Garehime's system, but only can not to break through the Lin's "raster curtain" means of A double-door "single person checkroom" with the weight

means! It would have been obvious the "single person checkroom" is a distinguishing feature then Garehime's invention, however as taught by Zekich, Feher, Borthayre to prevent the hijackers that are to be trifling matter more! Inventor had request that cannot to pass off fish eyes for pearls so as in this.

The Office Action to follow with interest to:

【Re claim 2, please note that the Zerick teachers the use of opening and closing the doors in preset program so that unauthorized people can (not) enter the restricted area.】 (page 6, line 7)

Inventor request that Examiner to view to compare the program control use for the double-door "single person checkroom" in Lin's invention Fig.3.

The Office Action with to bring up:

【Claim 4-6, as best understood, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Anastassakis.】 (page 6, line 9)

【Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre discloses all claimed parts of the invention except for weight sensor to detect the weight of the person requesting entry to an area. However, Anastassakis discloses a weight sensors to know the weight of the person requesting entry to an area is well known in the art.】 (page 6, line 12)

【It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used weight sensors in Garehime 's system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre and as taught by Anastassakis to prevent the hijackers from taking over the aircraft.】 (page 6, line 16)

The Office Action with an emphasis on Anastassakis discloses a weight sensors means that is related with Claim 4, only.

The traits of list in first defense by inventor:

【**Anastassakis**, (US Pat. No.3,750,158) patent, takes weight as the parameter to compare the difference resulting from the preset value. If the difference exceeds the predetermined range, an alarm will occur or another region will be controlled. The patent mainly involves "the comparative unit of digital weight", which is "IC" component available everywhere. Does that mean that we can use the patent of 3,750,158 if the unit is available?

Therefore, the patent of 3,750,158 does not affect the patent of Zhen-Man Lin, which uses digitized weight as another check means. The key of Zhen-Man Lin's patent is "system", and it is allowed to involve related patent in a huge anti-hijacking system】

Why the Examiner does not respond to the above-mentioned viewpoint in first defense by inventor and to repeat the Anastassakis's the comparative unit of digital weight means? The patent protective had surmounted deadline! Therefore, the comparative unit of digital weight means will not must get authority to use! The comparative unit of digital weight means should to be responsible for component of IC.

The following is a quotation **and definitions** under 35 U.S.C. 100 (a) & (b) which forms the basis for all obviousness that Lin's weight means process was an new invention or discovery reply for set forth in this Office action:

When used in this title unless the context otherwise indicates –

- (a) The term “invention ” means invention or discovery.
- (b) The term “process ” means process, art, or method, and includes a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or material.

It was quite obviousness that the weight means was a known process then is a new use in Lin's invention too.

Whether the new use is novelty invention or discovery?

The Examiner of Mr. Tien Dinh was all known so far that the weight means was nobody applies in safety system! Why? Because the weight means was false easily to make mistakes, but Lin's invention of in the double-door “single person checkroom” is that providing special beams of raster curtain means process for guarantee the test in accurately and had also guaranteed single person for detection means was a novel invention! The raster curtain means so far that was novelty invention or discovery and that was nobody applies is safety system too!

Therefore, the Examiner of Mr. Tien Dinh was must clearly known if he will still to be rejected Claim 1 (a) of Lin's invention, the Examiner of Mr. Tien Dinh was must enumerated the example proof that is whoever have invented in security or precaution skyjacking system field had grating curtain means in previous art!

The Office Action with to bring up the Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boudreau:

【Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre discloses all claimed parts of the invention except for the narcotic sprayer used to put terrorists to sleep. However, Boudreau discloses the use of narcotic sprayers is well known in the art. 】 (page 7, line 4)

【It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a narcotic sprayers in Garehime's system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre and as taught by Boudreau to prevent the hijackers from taking over the aircraft. 】 (page 7, line 7)

The defense by inventor:

In first of Office Action had made a statement to indicate that Garehime invention discloses a narcotic gun...but there was not find! Lin's invention of Claim 7 that's An airliner hijacking prevention system as claimed in claim 1, further comprising narcotic sprayer installed at a passage of the aircraft, the narcotic sprayer being responsive to the at least one monitoring device. The Garehime's system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre's invention is straggliest and out-of-date that before gets to confirm already! However, Who is Boudreau? It would have been obvious that the Claim 7 of Lin's invention cannot oppose by any one and to get patent is absolutely!

The Office Action with to bring up the Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre as pallied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Torian et al.

【Garehime as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre discloses all claimed parts of the invention except for the remote control airplane used to control the airliner. However, Torian et al discloses that an airplane used to control another aircraft is well known in the art. (please note, that remote control

aircrafts are notoriously well known in this day and age. (page 7, line 13)

【It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have used a remote control aircraft to control the hijacked aircraft in Garehime's system as modified by zekich, Feher, and Borthayre and as taught by Torian et al to prevent the hijackers from taking over the aircraft by having the remote control aircraft follow the hijacked aircraft so that the control signals can not be lost. 】 (page 7, line 18)

The defense by inventor:

The Garehime's system as modified by Zekich, Feher, and Borthayre's invention is straggiest and out-of-date those before get to confirm already! The Claim 9 of Lin's remote-control plane mean is completely different than Claim of Torian's invention of 35 years ago, the Examiner must to understand the radar-navigation and the satellite-navigation was two different levels:

1. The Claim 9 of Lin's remote-control plane means limited in Field of airliner hijacking prevention system;
2. The patent protective of Torian's invention was different field;
3. Lin's invention used the other inventor's patent same the Jacoby et al's invention in Zekich's invention, what of it?
4. I hope that the Examiner must to be know the airliner return navigation don't must to guide by radar;
5. As it should be, if the remote-control plane have install the Radar of Torian's invention is more ideal in the system.

It would have been obvious that the Claim 9 of Lin's invention cannot oppose by any one and to get patent is absolutely!

The viewpoint of examine to lacked notary-position shown in part of Response to Arguments: (page 8)

【 In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art.

In this case, the teaching of Zekich, Feher, Borthayre, Torian et al, Boudreau, and Anastassakis all teach the necessary modifications that would have been obvious to one skilled in the art make the Garehime's system more terrorists proof so that damages are prevented. 】

【The applicant's arguments center on the practicality of the references of the laws implemented by the U.S. Government. However, the Examiner would like to point out that the claims are met by the references. Therefore, the claims are anticipated by the noted references.】

【Please note that the claims do not call for the elements that the applicant supposedly claims would make the claims be allowable over the prior arts.】

Why could to said that the examiner was lacked notary-position in Office Action?